



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,627	11/08/2001	Martin Waugh	3561-84	4871

20575 7590 02/14/2007
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,627	WAUGH, MARTIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-28, 30-53, 55, 56 and 58-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-28, 30-53, 55-56 and 58-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 12/4/06, the following is a final office action. Claims 7, 29, 54 and 57 are cancelled. Claims 59-61 have been added. Claims 1-6, 8-28, 30-53, 55-56 and 58-61 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 12-14, 19-28, 31, 33, 34-36, 41-50, 53, 55, 56, 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al (US 6,182,097), and further in view of Weinberg et al, (US 5,974,572).

As per claims 1, 23, Hansen et al discloses:

Retrieving/retrieval software to retrieve a hit record of network traffic data, (Col. 12, lines 1-2, retrieving raw hit records, w/ Col. 4, lines 33-35, shows incorporation of Web Traffic);

Assigning/assignment software to assign the hit record to a visitor, (Col. 12, lines 9-10, distinguishing hit records according to the visit to which they belong, w/ col. 9, lines 16-18, visitor is assigned a visitor tag to each new hit);

Recognizing/recognition software to recognize visit information for the visitor based on the hit record, (Col. 12, lines 10-12, associating a visit index with each filtered hit record, w/ col. 9, lines 30-32, where it is shown that when each new visitor record data structure is created, an index number is assigned to the visit);

Storing/storing software to store the visit information for the visitor...in a database, (Col. 12, lines 12-16, storing the filtered hit records in a data storage device, in this case, the visit records are analogous to the filtered hit records since Hansen et al shows that a visit index is associated with each filtered hit record, and therefore each filtered hit record is specifically related to a visit. In addition, Hansen's method is related to building a database of information about visits as shown in col. 11, lines 28-29, therefore the step of storing in a storage device leads to the formation of the database structure).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the visit information in a database with the motivation of providing a quick and efficient method to access network usage information.

Hansen et al does not specifically disclose retrieval, assignment, recognition and storing software, but does show the use of a computing device in communication with the first and second Web sites, and operated under the control of Web-browser software. The computing device is responsible for requesting, retrieving and directing a

data request to either one of the Web sites in the abstract, lines 13-19, also, throughout the Hansen et al reference, Web software is used to track and identify visits.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to specifically incorporate software to retrieve, assign, recognize and store data into the invention with the motivation of utilizing resources available in a Web browser computing environment to retrieve, assign, recognize, and store data.

Hansen does not specifically disclose Identifying a content group viewed by the visitor/Identification software to identify a content group viewed by the visitor, or storing the content group viewed by the visitor, but does disclose a content provider for providing content to a viewer in col. 6, lines 46-51.

However, Weinberg et al discloses:

Identifying a content group viewed by the visitor/Identification software to identify a content group viewed by the visitor, or storing the content group viewed by the visitor, (Col. 16, lines 9-14, shows user can filter the content on a web site according to content/service filters, which filter out the URLs of specific content types such as, for example, images or plain text). Weinberg et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that content groups are used to filter types of information on a Web Page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to identify a content group viewed by the visitor/Identification software to identify a content group viewed by the visitor, or storing the content group

viewed by the visitor with the motivation of showing that information on a Web site can be grouped via content.

As per claims 2, 24, 46, Hansen et al discloses:

retrieving the hit record from a log file, (col. 8, lines 39-41, log file).

As per claims 3, 25, Hansen et al discloses:

retrieving the hit record from the database, (col. 10, lines 1-3, shadow-directory database contains hit information).

As per claims 4, 26, Hansen et al discloses:

wherein recognizing visit information includes assigning the hit record to a visit, (Col. Col. 9, lines 16-18, visitor assigned a visitor tag with each new hit).

As per claims 5, 27, Hansen et al discloses:

wherein assigning the hit record includes selecting the visit based on an Internet Protocol (IP) address within the hit record and a time delta since a previous hit record with the IP address, (Col. 1, lines 63-66, shows that for each hit, a logfile can be maintained and the information collected in this file can include the host address of the visiting client and time of the hit, w/ col. 2, lines 24-26, shows that it is eventually evident that from the examination of a logfile, which hit corresponds to which visit).

As per claims 6, 28, Hansen et al discloses:

wherein assigning the hit record includes selecting the visit based on a cookie within the hit record and a time delta since a previous hit record with the cookie, (col. 8, lines 13-19, cookie, w/ Col. 1, lines 63-66, shows for each hit, a logfile can be maintained and the information collected in this file can include the time of the hit).

As per claims 9, 31, 48, Hansen et al discloses:
the method further comprising extracting the visit information from a web-based form, (Col 12, lines 3-7, extracting).

As per claims 11, 33, 49, Hansen et al discloses:
the method further comprising eliminating inaccurate counting of visit information from the database, (Col. 8, lines 20-22, misuse of cookies).

As per claim 12, 34, Hansen et al discloses:
wherein eliminating inaccurate counting identifying an open visit, and deleting visit information derived from the open visit, (Col. 8, lines 13-23, disable cookie mechanism).

As per claims 13, 35, Hansen et al discloses:
the method further comprises storing the hit record in a database, (Col. 12, lines 12-16, storing the filtered hit records in a data storage device, in this case, the visit records are analogous to the filtered hit records since Hansen et al shows that a visit index is associated with each filtered hit record, and therefore each filtered hit record is specifically related to a visit. In addition, Hansen's method is related to building a database of information about visits as shown in col. 11, lines 28-29, therefore the step of storing in a storage device leads to the formation of the database structure);

eliminating inaccurate counting further includes regenerating visit information from the hit record in the database for the open visit, (Col. 7, lines 20-22, regeneration each time a Web site is altered).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the visit information in a database with the motivation of providing a quick and efficient method to access network usage information.

As per claims 14, 36, Hansen et al discloses:

detecting an open visit in a current time slice; determining a corresponding visit in an adjacent time slice; and adding visit information from the open visit to the corresponding visit, (Col. 2, lines 21-30, records request chronologically).

As per claims 19, 41, Hansen et al discloses:

wherein retrieving a hit record includes filtering the hit record, (Col. 12, lines 3-7, creating filtered hit record).

As per claims 20, 22, 42, 44, 50, Hansen et al discloses:

the method further comprising purging the visit information from the database/ further comprising purging the hit record from the database, (Col. 2, lines 61-7, Web page giving a user access to usage information, in this case, the visit/hit record information must be purged to the user in order for the user to access this type of usage information).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to purge the visit/hit record information with the motivation of allowing the release of this type of information to one who requests it.

As per claims 21, 43, 47, Hansen et al discloses:

further comprising storing the hit record in the database, (Col. 12, lines 12-16, storing the filtered hit records in a data storage device).

As per claim 45, Hansen et al discloses:

a computer system, (Abstract, lines 13-19, computing system that implements method);

at least one hit record on the computer system, Col. 12, lines 1-2, using the method to retrieve raw hit records);

a database on the computer system, the database designed to store visit information derived from the hit record, (Col. 12, lines 12-16, storing the filtered hit records in a data storage device, in this case, the visit records are analogous to the filtered hit records since Hansen et al shows that a visit index is associated with each filtered hit record, and therefore each filtered hit record is specifically related to a visit. In addition, Hansen's method is related to building a database of information about visits as shown in col. 11, lines 28-29, therefore the step of storing in a storage device leads to the formation of the database structure).

means for deriving visit information from the hit record on the computer system, the visit information including at least one content group viewed by at least one visitor, (Col. 12, lines 10-12, associating a visit index with each filtered hit record, w/ col. 9, lines 30-32, where it is shown that when each new visitor record data structure is created, an index number is assigned to the visit);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the visit information in a database with the motivation of providing a quick and efficient method to access network usage information.

Hansen does not specifically disclose the visit information including at least one content group viewed by at least one visitor, but does disclose a content provider for providing content to a viewer in col. 6, lines 46-51.

However, Weinberg et al discloses:

The visit information including at least one content group viewed by at least one visitor, (Col. 16, lines 9-14, shows user can filter the content on a web site according to content/service filters, which filter out the URLs of specific content types such as, for example, images or plain text). Weinberg et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that content groups are used to filter types of information on a Web Page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to identify a content group viewed by the visitor/Identification software to identify a content group viewed by the visitor, or storing the content group viewed by the visitor with the motivation of showing that information on a Web site can be grouped via content.

As per claims 53, 56, Hansen et al discloses:

Assigning/assignment software to assign a name to the visit information, col. 9, lines 30-32, shows that when each new visitor record data structure is created, an index number is assigned to the visit);

Identifying a uniform resource locator (URL) and a parameter name for the value for the visit information/identification software to identify a uniform resource locator (URL) and a parameter name for the value for the visit information, (col. 5, lines 49-56,

when link on a page is selected, the requested URL is downloaded along with the corresponding usage information);

Specifying/specification software to specify the URL and the parameter name as a source of a value for the visit information, col. 12, lines 10-12, associating a visit index with each hit record, w/ col. 5, lined 56-63, shows that click events for the requested URLs are intercepted, and requests are then dispatched to the servers, w/col. 6, lines 26-31, shows requests are issued during a visit, therefore requests for URLs serves as visit information, which therefore means that the requested URL downloaded along with the corresponding usage information is specified to the servers as visit information); and

Storing/storage software to store the name of the visit information and the source of a value for the visit information in a database, (Col. 12, lines 12-16, storing the filtered hit records in a data storage device, in this case, the name of the visit information is analogous to the visit index associated with filtered hit records, which is part of the filtered hit record and therefore also stored. In addition, Hansen's method is related to building a database of information about visits as shown in col. 11, lines 28-29, therefore the step of storing in a storage device leads to the formation of the database structure).

Hansen et al does not specifically disclose assignment, specifying and storing software, but does show the use of a computing device in communication with the first and second Web sites, and operated under the control of Web-browser software. The computing device is responsible for requesting, retrieving and directing a data request

to either one of the Web sites in the abstract, lines 13-19, also, throughout the Hansen et al reference, Web software is used to track and identify visits.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to specifically incorporate software to assign, specify, and store data into the invention with the motivation of utilizing resources available in a Web browser computing environment to assign, specify and store data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the visit information in a database with the motivation of providing a quick and efficient method to access network usage information.

As per claims 55, 58, Hansen et al discloses:

accessing the value for the visit information for a visitor, (Col. 12, lines 9-10, distinguishing hit records according to the visit to which they belong, w . col. 9, lines 16-18, visitor assigned visitor tag with each new hit); and

linking the visit information, the visitor, and the value for the visit information in the database, col. 9, lines 23-32, visitor data structure created, hit added to the structure and index number assigned to visit).

4. Claims 8, 10, 30, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al (US 6,182,097), and further in view of Weinberg et al, (US 5,974,572), and further in view of Dedrick (US 5,724,521).

As per claims 8, 30, neither Hansen et al, nor Weinberg et al disclose wherein recognizing visit information includes identifying an advertising campaign that brought

the visitor to a business, but does disclose commercial Web servers that record client requests, and generates a separate entry for each hit in col. 1, lines 60-63.

However, Dedrick discloses:

wherein recognizing visit information includes identifying an advertising campaign that brought the visitor to a business, (Col. 18, lines 34-39, advertisement title). Dedrick discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that advertisements are identified by the title, and used to determine if the advertisement falls within a particular consumer scale for visiting the advertisement information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to identify an advertising campaign that brought the visitor to a business with the motivation of determining and storing which advertising campaign is associated with a hit record.

As per claims 10, 32, neither Hansen et al, nor Weinberg et al disclose wherein extracting the visit information includes identifying an amount of money spent during a visit, but does disclose commercial Web servers that record client requests, and generates a separate entry for each hit in col. 1, lines 60-63.

However, Dedrick discloses:

wherein extracting the visit information includes identifying an amount of money spent during a visit, (Col. 11, lines 27-29, price of transaction). Dedrick discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of keeping a record of what the customer has spent for a transaction for the web content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include identifying an amount of money spent during a visit with the motivation of determining money spent associated with a hit record.

5. Claims 15-18, 37-40, 51, 52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al (US 6,182,097), and further in view of Weinberg et al, (US 5,974,572), and further in view of Foote (US 6,065,068).

As per claims 15-17, 37-39, 52, neither Hansen et al nor Weinberg et al disclose the following, but Hansen et al does show the use of a computing device in communication with the first and second Web sites, and operated under the control of Web-browser software. The computing device is responsible for requesting, retrieving and directing a data request to either one of the Web sites in the abstract, lines 13-19.

However Foote discloses:

using a semaphore on the database for a time range; and releasing the semaphore after the visit information is stored/blocking an operation on the time range until the semaphore is released/using a semaphore on the database; retrieving the visit information from the database; and releasing the semaphore after the visit information is retrieved, (Col. 5, line 60-Col. 6, line 9, semaphore request time, deny an access request). Foote discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of determining the times of subsequent access requests.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to use a semaphore on the database for a time range; and

releasing the semaphore after the visit information is stored with the motivation of setting a specific time range for accessing visit information.

As per claim 18, 40, 51, neither Hansen et al nor Weinberg et al disclose the following, but Hansen et al does show the use of a computing device in communication with the first and second Web sites, and operated under the control of Web-browser software. The computing device is responsible for requesting, retrieving and directing a data request to either one of the Web sites in the abstract, lines 13-19.

However Foote discloses:

Wherein storing the visit information further includes taking a snapshot of a setting for a database for use in analyzing the visit information, (Col. 36, lines 37-39, snap shot feature, in this case the snapshot captures the state of a module bank for later use as a power up configuration, which is stored in a non-volatile memory, therefore meaning, w/ col. 37, lines 13-25, shows analyzing by showing that the current physical model [of the module bank] is downloaded, but IDs must first be determined as equal). Foote discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of capturing the state of a module bank for later use as a power up configuration.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to store the take a snapshot of a setting for a database with the motivation of capturing visit information as it occurred.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/4/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 1, 23, and 45, the applicant argues that prior art does not teach "identifying a content group viewed by the visitor...or storing the content group viewed by the visitor". As discussed in the rejection above, Hansen discloses a method for characterizing patterns of usage of a website where hits are organized into visits, but does not teach "identifying a content group viewed by the visitor...or storing the content group viewed by the visitor". Hansen was combined with Weinberg to cure this deficiency. It is the combination of Hansen and Weinberg that teaches "identifying a content group viewed by the visitor...or storing the content group viewed by the visitor". Specifically, Weinberg discloses a method for generating a load test by using a server access log. In Weinberg, testing occurs according to browsing behaviors of typical users. As shown in the abstract, lines 11-13, user activity and behavioral data is superimposed on the site map. In Col, 16, lines 10-27 of Weinberg shows that when the filter button is used, all links and pages of a particular type or status is hidden. It is here that Weinberg teaches that the content of site maps are filtered. Since user activity data is superimposed on the site map as discussed above, then one can conclude that the user activity data is filtered. This passage also describes how user activity data is filtered by showing the function of the content/service filter as filtering out the URLs of content or service types such a HTML forms, images, etc. Applicant argues that the content in Weinberg is based on a "type" of the page and not "content

offered by the business that can be viewed by the visitor". However, content such as "images", can be viewed by the user. Applicant uses an example of a content group called "pants", and argues that this group can include content that might span any number of Weinberg's "content groups". However, if there is a content group called "pants", one called "shirts", and one called "ties", the content group "image" can also span both of these groups since a user can pull up images of "pants", "shirts", "ties", etc. Even though the images would be pants, shirts and ties, they are all still images and would therefore be in the same content group called "images". The point is that the content disclosed by Weinberg is grouped as a type of content that can be offered for view or access by the visitor on a Webpage.

As per claims 9, 31 and 48, the applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose extracting the visit information from a web-based form, but only describes extracting selected information. However, in Col 12, lines 3-7 of Hansen, the extraction includes selected information identifying the Web component to which the hit pertains. Since a Web-based form is a Web component, Hansen teaches this limitation.

As per claims 11, 33 and 49, applicant argues that Hansen has nothing to do with eliminating inaccurate counts, but discloses the use of cookies, which is likely to increase count inaccuracy. Hansen does disclose the use, and misuse of cookies in col. 8, lines 20-22, which allows the user to disable the cookie mechanism, which in turn leads to tracking without using cookies as disclosed in the next couple of lines. As described by Hansen, tracking without using cookies focuses on assigning a unique number to the user so that each time a hit is made by that user, the unique number is

taken into account, which in turn solves the issue of producing erroneous results for user hits by providing robust tracking of visitors.

As per claims 13, and 35, applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose regenerating visit information. However, Hansen describes conventional methods of regenerating usage information in order to keep track of this information in large traffic areas. Therefore, according to Hansen, it is old and well known to regenerate visit information.

As per claims 14 and 36, applicant argues that requesting records chronologically has nothing to do with detecting an open visit in a time slice, since an open visit is a visit from an earlier import operation to which a hit record is assigned. However, Col. 2, lines 21-30, of Hansen discloses that all record requests [for a visit] are recorded chronologically. Because of this type of recordation, each request [for a visit] occurs in a time sequence, and therefore, a first recorded request occurs earlier than a second recorded request. In this case, the first recorded request is analogous to the earlier import operation.

As per claims 20, 22, 42, 44 and 50, the applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose purging the hit record from the database. However, in Col. 2, lines 61-7, Hansen discloses a Web page giving a user access to usage information, in this case, the visit/hit record information must be purged in order for the user to access this type of usage information, reason being that the information must be cleared from the database before being transmitted to the user.

As per claims 53 and 56, the applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose "identifying a uniform resource locator and a parameter name for the value for the visit information". However, in col. 5, lines 49-56 of Hansen, does teach synchronization, and discusses that when link on a page is selected, the requested URL is downloaded along with the corresponding usage information. In the previous paragraph of Hansen, prior to the discussion about synchronization, Hansen points to Figs 1, and 1A-1C for an example as to how usage statistics (information) are accessed. Specifically, as per Fig. 1A, Hansen shows a Web page where parameter names such as "Get the context" and "Meet Nelson Roldan" are displayed once WWW.UWU.COM or Fig 1. is visited. Therefore, both the url for WWW.UVU.COM, and the parameter names "Get the context" and "Meet Nelson Roldan", which correspond to the url are downloaded.

As per claims 8 and 30, the applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose "wherein recognizing visit information includes identifying an advertising campaign that brought the visitor to a business". Specifically, applicant argues that Dedrick can identify the advertising campaign that "sends" a user to a business web site, but does not provide any way for the business to identify the advertising campaign the "brought" the visitor to the business. However, in Col. 18, lines 34-39 of Dedrick, the advertisement title is transmitted to the yellow page server. In Col. 3, lines 11-16 of Dedrick, it is shown that the yellow page server is coupled to the publisher unit and that the transfer of electronic information takes place between the two. Therefore the business (publisher) has access to information in the yellow page server, which includes

the advertisement title, thereby causing the publisher to identify the advertising campaign.

As per claims 15, 16, 17, 37, 38 and 39, applicant argues that prior art used does not disclose a semaphore since the Foote reference is not analogous art. However, Foote is analogous art since it discloses a system for monitoring activity on a network bus. As shown in col. 34, line 66-Col. 35, line 3, the Watch Dog watches for this type of activity. As in Hansen and Weinberg, activity on a network is monitored, although Hansen and Weinberg specifically disclose that the network is the Internet. Applicant also argues that Foote does not teach a semaphore as claimed, where a semaphore is released when the visit information is stored/retrieved. However, in Col. 5, line 60-Col. 6, line 9, Foote discloses the semaphore request time, for the purpose of determining the times of subsequent access requests on a network bus. In this case, when an access request takes place, the semaphore information on the time of access is released.

As per claims 18, 40 and 51, applicant argues that prior art used does not disclose a snapshot in analyzing visit information, but instead allowing a user to capture the state of a module bank for later use as a power up configuration upon the next power-up event. According to applicant, Foote's snapshot is limited to power-up configuration at the next power-up event. However, Foote also discloses that the snapshot [of the module bank] is stored in a non-volatile memory, and also shows analyzing it through having the current physical model [of the module bank] downloaded in col. 37, lines 13-25. In Foote, the snapshot image stores the state of the network

module itself. Upon power up configuration, access request take place on the network bus, and represents the visit information since the access requests of Foote are those that are monitored. Foote therefore discloses a snapshot/analysis of the access request, and therefore the visit information.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238

Art Unit: 3628

[After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. R. B.", followed by a long horizontal flourish.

A. R. B.
February 11, 2007